Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11380) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, yesterday the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] delivered a brilliant speech on the pending amendment. One of the very persuasive analogies which he brought to the attention of the Senate was the morality which all of us learned in the playground and the morality that we learn when we play games. People learn that they must be fair and just, and everyone is treated alike. The Senator from Oregon pointed out that is exactly this principle—of treating everyone alike—that is at stake here.

I should like to quote briefly from an article entitled "A New U.S. Judicial System." It is along the line of what the distinguished Senator from Oregon was talking about. I shall then yield to the Senator from Oregon, who has a short statement on the pending amendment:

> Suppose a baseball game is going on.
>
> The score is 1 to 0. The team that is losing is at bat in the last of the ninth inning. The bases are loaded and there are two out. The count is three balls and two strikes.
>
> The pitcher winds up and throws. The batter doesn't swing. All eyes are on the umpire to see if the pitch was a ball or a strike.
>
> Then a strange thing happens. The umpire announces that he is not going to call whether it was a ball or a strike, but he is going to let the pitcher call whether it was a ball or a strike.
>
> The pitcher says it was a strike. The game is over. The pitcher's team is the winner.
>
> What if one's child was the batter and the pitch was over his head?
>
> How could one ever explain to him what had happened? One would never be able to convince him that there was any fairness or sportsmanship connected with such a proceeding.
>
> When a State takes away a right given in the Constitution and the Supreme Court refuses to hear the case and leaves the matter up to the State, it is similar to the umpire refusing to call the pitch and letting the pitcher call whether his own pitch was a ball or a strike.

So when a State takes away a right given in the Constitution and the Supreme Court under congressional duress refuses to hear the case for more than a year, it is similar to the umpire being yanked off the field, refusing to call the pitch and letting the pitcher call whether his own pitch was a ball or a strike. What the Dirksen amendment would do is strictly analogous. It would tell the "umpire" to walk off the field for a year and not to call decisions on equal voting rights as the Court sees them. It means that the right, which we have augmented in the past several years and which is so fundamental, will be foregone for a period of at least a year and, as many of us interpret it, for as long as 5 or 6 years. Inded if the Dirksen amendment succeeds in its purpose and a constitutional amendment passes ending one man, one vote, the end will be forever.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, ordinarily, Walter Lippmann is one of the bright spots on the editorial page of the Washington Post. But this column today is a thorough-going obfuscation of the apportionment issue.

Mr. Lippmann tells us that he thinks—

> This great change in the political balance of power should have also the approval of Congress and be subjected to the test of a constitutional amendment.

Why should it have the approval of Congress? The powers of Congress are not plenary. There is the little matter of the powers of Congress being enumerated and the powers of the courts being enumerated in the Constitution.

I would have Mr. Lippmann read that section of the Constitution. His column this morning shows that he needs to refresh his memory with regard to the Constitution from beginning to end.

I do not believe there is any power given to Congress to tell the courts how they shall decide a certain class of cases. That is what the Dirksen amendment seeks to do. I share the view expressed by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] that any court would most likely ignore the language of the Dirksen amendment as an illegal and extra constitutional infringement on the judicial power.

A constitutional amendment on the matter is quite within the framework of that system. But I cannot discern from his column today whether Mr. Lippmann favors a constitutional amendment authorizing malapportionment. He says the reapportionment cases should "be subjected to the test of a constitutional amendment. Taking this to be the purpose of the Dirksen proposal, it seems to me sound and in the end desirable."

If Mr. Lippmann is saying that the end justifies the means, then he is straying far from his usual appreciation of the virtues of a constitutional system, especially ours. But the rest of his column seems to argue that reapportionment according to population is sound and should be encouraged.

Yet the only purpose of a constitutional amendment would be to put apportionment by population beyond the reach of achievement. The only purpose of a constitutional amendment—for which the Dirksen amendment is designed to gain time—is to freeze the very system Mr. Lippmann feels is outdated.

All the advocates of the Dirksen amendment—including Mr. Lippmann—have overlooked the history of most of these reapportionment cases. Reapportionment is not something the courts are forcing on the States in preemptory and arbitrary fashion. Take Oklahoma, for example, which is being cited as a State in some kind of anarchy as a result of a reapportionment order.

The Federal Court first directed reapportionment in that State in 1962. But after listening to members of the State legislature faithfully promise to redistrict at the forthcoming session, the Court decided not to press its own order, but to give the legislature the opportunity of doing the job. Yet the State legislature came and went without acting on reapportionment.

I would like to have Mr. Lippmann tell us how long he thinks the States should be given to conform. These cases have been in the courts for years before a decision is ever reached. The legislatures have years of notice that they are going to have to bring themselves up to date. Even after the Court renders a decision, the States are still given the opportunity to do their own redistricting.

Let me tell Mr. Lippmann one of the facts of political life that he may not have heard: the purpose of the Dirksen amendment is not to give the States a breather in complying with Baker against Carr. The purpose of the rider is to give time for a constitutional amendment to be passed that will wipe out Baker against Carr for all time—if the supporters of the Dirksen amendment have their way.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. In the first place, let me say that this is an excellent speech. The Senator hits the issue right on the nose. The last point the Senator made is absolutely true. There is no question about it. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has said so. He has said the purpose of the amendment is to provide time for a constitutional amendment. Such an amendment would freeze forever State after State on an area basis.

Mr. MORSE. I do not think there is any doubt about it.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. McNAMARA. Is it not true that, under the Dirksen amendment, the ratification of a constitutional amendment would take place under what the Supreme Court has ruled is an illegal setup?

Mr. MORSE. Of course. I am about to make that point. As I said yesterday, I think the Dirksen amendment is unconstitutional.

Ever since 1962, when Baker against Carr was handed down, every single malapportionment legislature has been on notice that it was going to have to reform itself to represent people. It can be said that the States have already had at least 2 years' breathing time even if they have not been subjected to a court case.

In specific cases, the courts have uniformly given the States the chance to do the job, sometimes setting a certain date on which reapportionment must have been carried out.

The courts are giving the States plenty of breathing time. They are giving the States plenty of opportunity to reapportion. I do not know of a single in-

stance where the Federal courts have put their own reapportionment plan into execution without first having given the State legislature or the appropriate State agency time in which to reapportion.

The complaints about the lack of breathing time do not really relate to the time needed to reapportion; they refer to the time needed to pass a constitutional amendment which will relieve them of the need to reapportion. And in the amendment process, who ratifies on behalf of the requisite three-fourths of the States? Why, the very same State legislatures that are malapportioned.

The purpose of the Dirksen amendment is to give the malapportioned legislatures a chance to save themselves by constitutional amendment and continue to thrust upon the electorate of this country the present evils of malapportioned legislatures.

Congress could provide that ratification be submitted to State conventions, but that process has not, to my knowledge, been used.

It must also be mentioned to Mr. Lippmann that there is no evidence of any confusion or disruption among the people as a whole over court orders on this matter. I have not received any comment from Oregon or elsewhere about it. Mr. Lippmann says there is no critical emergency which makes the delay proposed by Senator DIRKSEN intolerable. But neither is there any critical emergency that makes the delay desirable. The only people who are "terrified," to use Mr. Lippmann's word, by reapportionment are the local politicians who stand to have their safe, rottenborough seats taken away—and they should have been taken away from them long ago.

These districts have long been the foundation of rural and small town political organizations. Once they consisted of human population; today the content of that foundation has been eaten away to the point where it can only be propped up by constitutional amendment.

Far from preserving States rights and powers, the Dirksen amendment and any constitutional amendment that follows will destroy the States. These proposals will reduce the States to mere relics of history, preserved to keep some jobs safe for a small clique of local politicians but unable to function as useful governments because they no longer reflect the will of the people.

PEOPLE WILL HAVE NO VOICE IN MOST STATES

I also want to comment on something said yesterday about Oregon by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. His remarks indicated that the people of the States should, through a constitutional amendment, be able to retain malapportionment if they want it. But I note that not many States give their people any voice in the matter. Only where apportionment is submitted to initiative or referendum would the people of a State, as contrasted from the political officeholders, have any chance to decide the issue.

Why in the world a malapportioned legislature should be allowed to decide this issue is beyond me. If the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and others want the people to have a voice, the only way they can be given that voice is to give them a direct vote by way of initiative or referendum, which is what Oregon has. That is the way we got rid of the rotten boroughs. That is the way we achieved reapportionment. That is the way the voice of the people was heard. But I say to my friend from New York, who is a legal authority and a distinguished former attorney general of the State of New York, that if he thinks this problem is to be solved by having the legislatures do it, when they are already rotten to the core in the areas where malapportionment exists, he has another thought coming.

In my judgment, we must keep in mind what the Dirksen amendment would do. It would perpetuate this travesty. That is what the supporters of it want. They do not want one vote per person. They want people living in minority population areas to continue to control the legislatures and deprive the people of their rights.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. First let me thank the Senator for his high opinion of my legal ability. I reciprocate it.

Mr. MORSE. My high opinion of the Senator from New York is not limited to his legal ability.

Mr. JAVITS. Let me tell the Senator what I have in mind, and if he wants to make a critical analysis of it I am sure he will, in his usual, candid way, give it. I had in mind that an amendment to the U.S. Constitution should be adopted by three-fourths of the States, through their legislatures, which would entitle a State to amend its own constitution to provide that one house shall be apportioned not on the basis of population, and which required that the people of that State would have a right to judge whether or not they would amend their constitution. We face a serious situation in this regard. If the decisions of the Supreme Court on this subject, Baker against Carr and Reynolds against Sims, should be construed as meaning that the acts of our State legislatures are unlawful because so many of the State legislatures—44 out of 50—are based upon an apportionment which the Supreme Court has stricken down or would strike down, we are really in chaos.

In the final analysis, it seems to me, if there were time, the people of each State, including the State of Oregon, would have the opportunity, when it comes to amending their State constitution, to determine this question.

That was the limited point I was making in my statement on this subject yesterday.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. I appreciate the fact that the Senator from Oregon is yielding to me. I shall be very brief. I could not let the statement with respect to the will of the people go by, without saying a word about Colorado.

We have the initiative and referendum in Colorado, and we put two constitutional amendments on the ballot in 1962, one looking for equal population districts in both the house and the senate, and one looking to districts based on population and other elements for the senate.

By a 2-to-1 majority the one providing for what we call the Federal system, passed in every county of the State; the other one was rejected in every county of the State.

Now comes the Supreme Court and states, "We do not care about the will of the people; it cannot be weighed by that vote."

Mr. MORSE. I should like to make two points very quickly. The first is that, of course, the people of no one State alone, even if they have a greater vote, could prevent the Supreme Court from declaring what the constitutional rights of the American people are. The second point I wish to make is that I thoroughly endorse the Colorado system. It is the kind of system which I believe gives the ultimate assurance that the people will express their will.

If the people all over the country had the same power that the people of Colorado and the people of Oregon have, and they decided on a constitutional amendment which would have the effect of reversing the Supreme Court decision, or in amending their State constitutions, no one would find the Senator from Oregon raising one objection, because the people themselves would be making that determination.

The point I was making was that to have this matter decided by three-fourths of the legislatures, most of which are malapportioned, in my judgment, is letting the defendant write his own judgment.

Mr. DOMINICK. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator yielding to me. I wished to get the Colorado situation into the RECORD.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In connection with what the Senator has said, I should like to point out that in Ohio we have a provision in our constitution that every 20 years there must be submitted to the electorate the issue: "Shall there be a constitutional convention?"

That provision of the constitution was adopted in 1903. Three times that proposition was submitted to the electorate at a regular election. On each occasion the people voted down the issue that a convention shall be called.

I do know that the last time that issue was submitted, one of the principal questions argued was the alleged malassignment of legislative representatives to various areas.

Even in the face of that argument, which was vigorously made, the issue was turned down by the voters overwhelmingly. To recapitulate, on three occasions the arguments were made to the electorate that there was a malassignment of representation and that a constitutional convention should be called; yet on each occasion the voters turned down that proposal.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I applaud that section of the Ohio constitu-

tion. However, even that section of the Constitution, when it is applied gives us no assurance that the people understood the great constitutional question that was raised by Baker against Carr. It gives no assurance that this issue of apportionment was controlling in their decision.

The point I am making is that if we are to have a constitutional amendment submitted—and I recognize what the terms of our Constitution are—I believe we will get closer to the will of the people if we have, in connection with this matter, a ratification by way of a constitutional convention rather than ratification by the legislatures, for the reason that the legislatures are malapportioned in most instances, and that is what the Supreme Court struck down in its landmark decision in Baker against Carr. And if any constitutional amendment is approved there is no assurance that the people will ever have any voice in the decision whether to retain malapportionment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The constitution of Ohio was amended in 1903. In that constitutional provision dealing with the assignment of representatives to the legislature it was stated that each county shall have at least one representative. Of course that would run head on into the argument that the selection must be based on population.

I point out, however, that when that amendment was submitted to the people of Ohio, that each county, regardless of population, shall have at least one representative, the people approved it by a vote of 98 percent to 2 percent.

Mr. MORSE. As the Senator knows, 1903 in Ohio was not 1964 in Ohio. In 1903 Ohio was a great rural State. In 1964 it is characterized by great industrialization and great population. In the intervening years great metropolitan areas have risen in Ohio. The result is that the people of the metropolitan areas of Ohio are being discriminated against so far as their voting power is concerned in favor of the sparsely populated counties.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The answer to that is that in 1952 there was submitted to the people of Ohio the question, "Shall we have a constitutional convention?" The proponents of the proposal, that a convention be had, argued that it was especially necessary in order to readjust the assignment of representatives and senators in the State. The people by an overwhelming vote again voted down the proposal. That was 1952, not 1903.

Mr. MORSE. My answer to that is that in 1962 the great landmark decision of the Supreme Court in Baker against Carr had not been handed down, and the people of Ohio had not been educated in regard to the constitutional guarantees to them and all other citizens that are provided in the decision. The people of Ohio are very, very intelligent, or the Senator from Ohio would not be a Member of the Senate.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is the first issue on which I agree with the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I am satisfied that once the intelligent people of Ohio become educated to the great protection the Supreme Court has given them in Baker against Carr, they will not be of the same opinion still as they were in 1952. I have that faith in the electorate of Ohio. It is a justifiable faith because of the votes they gave to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE]. They recognize that he, as their Senator, has a right to be mistaken now and then, as he is mistaken on the issue involving Baker against Carr.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Baker against Carr was decided in 1962, was it not?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does not the Senator from Oregon think that the people of Ohio and other States ought to have a little time to allow this omnipotent intelligence of the Supreme Court to percolate through their minds so that they will be able to adjust themselves to the decision?

Mr. MORSE. They are very apt, smart students. They do not need time ad infinitum to understand the decision.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. One does not insult them with an argument concerning what the people of Ohio will do. I will take my chances with them, once they understand the facts.

In most cases, the State constitutions would be revised or affirmed by the State legislature or through a procedure directed by the legislature. Where a State constitution already provides for apportionment by area, how would the people have any chance at all to voice an opinion about it, if they do not have the privilege of direct action?

The Senator from New York mentioned Oregon. Oregon reapportioned as recently as 1961, and is said to be the only State that apparently is not required to reapportion again subsequent to Baker against Carr.

The Senator from New York declared that the people of Oregon should have the right to area representation, if they want it. I want him to know that they have always had that right, they have exercised it, and they have rejected area representation. All this was done without reference to Supreme Court rulings, but it was done through the mechanism of initiative and referendum, without which Oregon would undoubtedly be as badly apportioned as are most other States.

The Oregon constitution itself, adopted in 1859, called for apportionment of both houses by population. As happened in so many States, the legislature failed to abide by the directive of the State constitution to reapportion after each census. Finally, in 1952, another provision in the State constitution—that of initiative—was invoked. In November of 1952, the voters by initiative reapportioned the State legislature.

After the 1960 census, reapportionment was carried out through the regular procedures of the State constitution and an initiative was not necessary. That is why it is said that Oregon alone is not affected by the Supreme Court decisions.

Then there were some who thought area representation should replace population representation in the State constitution. So in November 1962, there was another initiative put on the ballot. It proposed an amendment to the State constitution repealing population and substituting area as a basis for apportionment.

This measure was overwhelmingly rejected. Sixty-two percent of the voters in that election voted it down.

Now, if there were the kind of people's choice the Senator from New York had in mind there might be something to be said for his proposals. He said:

> I see no reason why the people of a State should not so decide.

But in most States the matter would be decided by those selfsame legislatures that are the object of the court cases. There would be no referendum, much less initiative.

The Supreme Court has spoken on a great constitutional guarantee. It would be presumptuous—it would be legislaively improper—for Congress, through the Dirksen amendment, to adopt this device for undercutting or undermining the decision of the Supreme Court and for seeking to accomplish a reversal of that decision.

I close with the point I made yesterday, for it is close to my heart. We are making a great mistake in connection with the Dirksen amendment. I am satisfied that it will feed those in this country who would like to fan into a fire a burning disrespect for the Supreme Court of the United States. The Dirksen amendment has the effect of undercutting and undermining respect for the Supreme Court. The Senate of the United States should not be a party to it. The amendment ought to go down to an overwhelming defeat.

I thank the Senator for yielding. If he will permit me to do so, I should like to say to him on the floor of the Senate what I have said to him privately: He and the others in his group who are seeking to take the necessary time to inform the American people about the issues involved in this dispute, and are seeking to focus public attention on the floor of the Senate these hours, are performing a highly patriotic legislative service to the people of the entire Nation.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the senior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the article entitled "The Dirksen Breather," written by Mr. Walter Lippmann, and published in the Washington Post of today, August 18, 1964. Since I criticized Mr. Lippmann's article in my speech, it would be unfair of me to have referred to it and not place it in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DIRKSEN BREATHER

(By Walter Lippmann)

Although it is a bit awkward and rather inconvenient to make Congress deal with apportionment at the tail end of the session, the importance of the subject is overriding. The real issue, as I see it, is whether reapportionment of the State legislatures, which is necessary but also a far-reaching change of habit and custom, should be propelled by something more than the Federal courts alone—whether, that is to say, this great change in the political balance of power should have also the approval of Congress and be subjected to the test of a constitutional amendment. Taking this to be the purpose of the Dirksen proposal, it seems to me sound and in the end desirable.

The heart of the matter is that since about 1890 the United States, which was then composed two-thirds of people from farms and villages, has been transformed. Two-thirds of the Americans now live in cities or in the suburbs. But the apportionment of at least 44 of the State legislatures does not represent this change. In these 44 States, less than 40 percent of the people elect a controlling majority of the legislature. In 13 of these States, one-third or less of the people can elect a controlling majority of the legislature.

While the statistics of this misrepresentation cry out for reform, it is nevertheless true that the problem here, unlike that of the civil rights bill a few months ago, is not such a present danger that delay is intolerable. It is essential that the city and suburban people be properly represented in their State legislatures in order that they may be better able to deal with their pressing needs. But, there is no critical emergency which makes the delay proposed by Senator DIRKSEN intolerable.

There are also positive advantages in the Dirksen breather. It involves Congress, not only the Supreme Court, in the problem of apportionment, and the pause provided by the Dirksen rider may help to make the coming reapportionment seem less terrifying to those who will lose by it.

For many of us this will help to assuage a troubled conscience about the dilemma posed by the Supreme Court's decision in the Alabama case and Mr. Justice Harlan's dissenting opinion. The dissenting opinion argued powerfully against bringing the affairs of the State legislatures into the Federal courts. The opinion was, in my view, unanswerable but for one enormous fact. That is that the unrepresentative State legislatures are unwilling to reform themselves. The underrepresented voters in the cities and suburbs have little or no power to compel reform. In this situation, when there is indubitable evil for which there is no known legal remedy, the intervention of the Supreme Court was the only way of breaking the deadlock.

But such a choice of the lesser of two evils is not attractive, and as one of those troubled by it, I welcome Senator DIRKSEN's action in taking the question to Congress and to the amending process.

The public discussion, which will ensue, will be clarified if we distinguish the two principal arguments which have been used to justify the overrepresentation of the rural voters. One reason, which is as old as the Nation, is that the excitable working people in the cities are not to be trusted as against the stable and virtuous farmers, and that the representative system should be constructed so as to prevent the urban masses from ruling the State. This is the principle of the New York State constitution which was framed before the turn of the century.

This reason could prevail when the city people were still a minority. It cannot prevail much longer now that they have become a preponderant majority.

But there is another reason, closely related in practice but separate in theory. It is, as Madison put it, that it is necessary to "refine the will of the people," and that one of the best ways of doing this is to have a legislature with two houses in which the upper house is more stable and more conservative.

The real question which will confront the States is how to construct senates in which, though all voters are equal, the senators will check and balance the lower house.

It is not an insoluble problem. The States will have to deal with the problem by making the senatorial districts larger and the number of senators smaller. Each senator will therefore represent a much more varied constituency than a member of the lower house. The States can give the senators a longer term and higher pay. This will tend to give the senators a broader view, a less hurried view, more honor, a greater independence and sense of responsibility.

These are ways to refine the will of the people without obstructing it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, not only is Mr. Walter Lippmann a highly influential columnist; not only are his writings read all over America; but he is regarded as a man of integrity, towering ability, and profound understanding. When he writes as he has written on this subject, what he says must carry weight with thoughtful people everywhere. It is most unfortunate—in my judgment, it is a real tragedy—that Mr. Lippmann has not taken more time to study this Dirksen amendment. I earnestly hope that he will read the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Oregon, which I believe are absolutely irrefutable and unanswerable, if one considers what the Dirksen amendment will do.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 2288) for the relief of John J. Feeney.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 7073. An act to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 in order to increase the limitation on the amount of loans which may be insured under subtitle A of such act;

H.R. 9638. An act to amend section 27 of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended, in order to promote the development of phosphate on the public domain;

H.R. 9803. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to acquire the building constructed on the Fort Jay Military Reservation, N.Y., by the Young Men's Christian Association;

H.R. 11960. An act to authorize the exchange of public domain lands heretofore withdrawn and reserved for the use of the Hanford project of the Atomic Energy Commission, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12091. An act to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of approximately 9,500,000 pounds of sisal from the national stockpile;

H.R. 12278. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of Sunnyvale, State of California, certain lands in the county of Santa Clara, State of California, in exchange for certain other lands; and

H.J. Res. 793. Joint resolution authorizing the United Spanish War Veterans to erect a memorial in the District of Columbia or its environs.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 274. Concurrent resolution accepting the statue of Father Eusebio Francisco Kino, of Arizona, presented by the State of Arizona, to be placed in the Statuary Hall collection;

H. Con. Res. 320. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress on disposal from the national stockpile of certain materials; and

H. Con. Res. 343. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the enforcement of the provisions of article 19 of the United Nations Charter.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred or placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H.R. 7073. An act to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 in order to increase the limitation on the amount of loans which may be insured under subtitle A of such act; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H.R. 9638. An act to amend section 27 of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended, in order to promote the development of phosphate on the public domain; and

H.R. 11960. An act to authorize the exchange of public domain lands heretofore withdrawn and reserved for the use of the Hanford project of the Atomic Energy Commission, and for other purposes; placed on the calendar.

H.R. 9803. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to acquire the building constructed on the Fort Jay Military Reservation, N.Y., by the Young Men's Christian Association;

H.R. 12091. An act to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of approximately 9,500,000 pounds of sisal from the national stockpile; and

H.R. 12278. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of Sunnyvale, State of California, certain lands in the county of Santa Clara, State of California, in exchange for certain other lands; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.J. Res. 793. Joint resolution authorizing the United Spanish War Veterans to erect a memorial in the District of Columbia or its environs; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following concurrent resolutions were referred as indicated:

To the Committee on Rules and Administration:

H. Con. Res. 274. Concurrent resolution accepting the statue of Father Eusebio Francisco Kino, of Arizona, presented by the State of Arizona, to be placed in the Statuary Hall collection.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the statue of Father Eusebio Francisco Kino, presented by the State of Arizona, to be placed in the Statuary Hall collection, is accepted in the